



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

GAJUS OR GAIÛS?

BY FREDERIC D. ALLEN.

WHETHER the praenomen *Gaius* was two syllables or three, ought not to be a matter of doubt, and there must be plenty of scholars who are well aware of the facts. Nevertheless, misleading statements are found in several of the books to which one would naturally turn for instruction on such a point,¹ and the writer has often wished that some one would collect the evidence bearing on it. But the immediate occasion of the present attempt is the fact, recently brought to his notice, that the two Latin dictionaries most used in this country — both the work of the same accomplished scholar — give exactly opposite directions for the pronunciation of the word.

The evidence for the two forms respectively stands about thus : —

Testimony for Gaiûs : —

Cassius *Gaiûs* hic operarius, quem Cephalonem.

Lucil. v. 355 Lachm. (xi, v. 22, Müll.).

Cinnast *Gaiûs*, is sibi parauit.

Catull. 10. 30.

post *Gaiûm*que Luciumque consedit.

Martial, v, 14.

peruigil in pluma *Gaiûs* ecce iacet.

Martial, ix, 92.

Gaiûs a prima tremebundus luce salutat.

Ibidem.

Gaiûs et mallet uerba mille pati.

Ibidem.

non mauis quam ter *Gaiûs* esse tuus.

Ibidem.

¹ For instance, in Madvig's grammar, and in Gossrau's (1880), and in Kühner's large grammar (1877), and Schweizer-Sidler's new work (1888), no pronunciation but *Gajus* (or *Cajus*) is mentioned. Others represent the trisyllabic form as exceptional or poetic. So Roby's grammar, and Georges' (1879) and Heinichen's (1875) dictionaries.

Gāiūs hanc lucem gemma mihi Iulius alba.

Martial, xi, 36.

Gāiūs ut fiat Iulius et Proculus.

Ibidem.

emptum plus minus asse *Gāiānō*.

Statius, Silv. iv, 9, 22.

Gāiūs prænomen inde C notatur, G sonat.

Terentian. Maurus, 897.

'stirps' uelut dixit disertus Gracchus alter *Gāiūs*.

Ibidem 988.

nomine Longinius, præn nomine *Gāiūs* olim.

CIL. X, 8131 (Stabiae).

Stallius *Gāiūs* has sedes Hauranus tuetur.

CIL. X, 2971 (Naples).

Γάϊϛ, σὸν δὲ πατὴρ χερὶ δέξεται εὐκτὸν Ἰουλον.

Apollonides, Anth. Pal. x, 19.

Γάϊϛ ἐκπνεύσας τὸ πανύστατον ἐχθὲς ὁ λεπτός.

Lucillius, Anth. Pal. xi, 92.

ἐγγράψαντες ἄνω, Γάϊϛ ἐκφέρεται.

Ibidem.

οὕτω κονφότατος πέλε Γάϊϛ, ὥστ' ἐκολύμβα.

Same, Anth. Pal. xi, 100.

Γάϊϛ, καὶ σὺ φοβοῦ, μὴ καὶ σέ τις ἐγκαταλέξῃ.

Same, Anth. Pal. xi, 265.

Γάϊϛ ὦ μερόπων ἐλπίδες οὐ μόνιμοι.

Inscr. Forum Iulii, Kaibel n. 579,

"ii fere saeculi."

Γάϊϛ εἰμαρτῇ ἀλόκῳ τόδε σῆμα θανούσῃ.

Inscr. Macedonia, Kaibel n. 525; late Roman time; incorrect and clumsy.

[Γ]άϊϛ Ἀνδρομένους ἐν[θά]δ' ἔχω φθίμενον.

Inscr. Galatia, Kaibel n. 405 = CIG. 4132; Kaibel's restoration; probable.

Γάϊϛ οὗτος ἐγώ . . .

Beginning of elegiac inscription; Naxos, Bull. Corr. Hell. ix, p. 502.

Testimony for Gaius:—

languentem *Gāiūm* morituum dixerat olim.

Ausonius, Ep. 75 (p. 312, Peiper).

'quis tu'? '*Gāiūs*,' ait. 'uiuisne'? hic abnuat, 'et quid.'

Ibidem.

tum *Gaius*: 'metuas nihil. Eunome; dixi ego et omnes.'

Ibidem.

οὐρανὸν, ὦ Ρώμας, Γαίῃ, πάτρας ἔρμα.

Antipater, Anthol. Palat. ix, 59.

ΣΤΗΛΑΙΣ Ἰούλιος ἐν[θα] πατρὸς Γαίου κατάκειμαι.

Inscr. Thessaly, Bull. Corr. Hell. xiii, p. 392.

καὶ παῖδες φθιμένο[ιο] περικ[λείτ]ον [Γ]αίου [ι]ο.

Inscr. Galatia, Kaibel n. 405 = CIG. 4132;

Kaibel's restoration; not certain.

Priscian, vii, p. 302 K. (Hertz): "de 'Pompei' et 'Vultei' et 'Gai' et similibus uocatiuis, quae i loco consonantis ante 'us' habent in nominatiuis, dubitatur utrum i extrema pro uocali an pro consonante sit accipienda, quomodo in aliis casibus, quod magis more antiquo rationabilius esse uidetur. Nam solebant illi non solum in principio sed etiam in fine syllabae ponere i loco consonantis, idque in uetustissimis inuenies scripturis, quotiens inter duas uocales ponitur, ut 'eius,' 'Pompeiius,' 'Vulteius,' 'Gaiius.'"

Probus, p. 104 K., gives *Gaius* as the pattern of nouns which "ius syllaba definiuntur," as distinguished from those which "us syllaba post i litteram definiuntur" (pattern *Sempronius*).

Marius Victorinus, p. 24, l. 21 K.: "sibi autem ipsa subiungitur in his, ut 'aiio,' 'Troia,' 'Gaius,' 'Aiiax.'" ¹

There is a penumbra of doubtful cases, with which I did not encumber the above list. For completeness' sake I will enumerate them.

(1) Lucian Müller has conjectured another *Gaius* into Lucilius (xxvi, 1 = 859 Lachm., *nam Gaiūm* for *Manium*).

(2) On the other hand the Ausonian examples of *Gajus* may well be increased by three, as the substitution of *Gaius*, *Gaio* for *Caesar*, *Caesare* as the name of Caligula in the 'Caesares' ² has everything in its favor except the manuscripts.

(3) On which side Γαῖνός (Γ γαῑ Γ), Kaibel n. 445, should count is not clear, as the Greeks made the ending -iānus either -iānός or -iāνός; but -iāνός is more common.

¹ But a little further on (p. 27, l. 9) he gives 'Troia,' 'aiio,' 'Graiius,' 'Aiiax,' as examples of "i duplicata"; it is therefore very likely that *Graiius* originally stood in the first passage also.

² Monost. ii, 4; iv, 4; Tetrast. iv, 1. In Peiper's edition, pp. 184, 186, 188.

(4) In the Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique, vol. viii, p. 239, the following pentameter verse may be read, in an inscription of Euménia in Phrygia, of a late epoch : —

μούσ[αις δ]σκηθεῖς [Γ]άιος πραγματικός.

It is hard to decide whether neglect of position in the syllable -os was intended, or a spondee in the latter half of the pentameter.¹

(5) A late epitaph from Aquileia, CIL. V, 923, contains the limping distich : —

C. Manlius hic Valerianus nomine dictus
Sentilius fratri quia meritis posuit;

but from such doggerel it is hardly possible to infer whether the writer pronounced his name *Gaius* or *Gaius*.

(6) More promising looks at first sight an interesting inscription of Casinum, CIL. X, 5282, which may with probability be assigned to Cicero's time.² It reads in the CIL., with Mommsen's supplements, thus : —

[*Heic est situs Q*]ueinctius Gaius Protymus
[*amicis su*]mma cum laude probatus,
[*quouis ing*]enium declarat pietatis alumnus
[*Gaius Queinc*]tius Valgus patronus.

It is obvious that verses were intended by the writer ; but what sort of verses? The second and third lines suggest hexameters ; the first

¹ Of the latter phenomenon, the following cases (all inscriptional) are known to me : —

- . . . πλήσουσιν γενέτ[αι].
- . . . ἀρέσκουσα κλυτή.
Bull. Corr. ix, 519.
- . . . terram optate leuem.
CIL. VI, 14831.
- . . . tum sortita lares.
CIL. III, 3146.
- . . . mors ipsa eripuit.
CIL. V, 3403.

For neglect of position in Greek verse, see the examples collected by Wagner, Quaestiones de epigrammatis Graecis, p. 63 f., and by me, Papers of American School, vol. iv, p. 79.

² On C. Quinctius Valgus, known from other inscriptions, see Dessau in Hermes, xviii, p. 620 f.

and fourth seem more like Saturnians. Bücheler, whose remarks are given in the CIL., has in mind a Saturnian reconstruction, something like this : —

[*Heic est situs Q*]ueinctiūs Gāiūs Protýmus
 [bonēis uireis sū]mma qúm laudé probátus,
 [quoius ing]eniúm declárat pietatís alúmnuſ
 [*Gāiūs Quetnc*]tiūs Válgús patrónus.

The difficulties involved in this, especially in the third line, are obvious, and are pointed out by Bücheler himself. Nevertheless, he appears to think it certain that the first verse at least was meant as a Saturnian. I should be glad of another case of *Gaius*, but I cannot lay any stress on this. In fact, with a very little snipping and a sufficient disregard for final *s*, these verses might all be filled out as hexameters.¹

(7) Priscian, in the sequel to the passage quoted above (VII, p. 302 K) lays down the rule “omnis enim uocatiuus in *i* desinens una syllaba minor debet esse suo nominatiuo, ut Sallustius o Sallusti,” etc. A little further on (p. 304) he says distinctly that the vocatives *Pompei*, *Vultei*, and *Gai* “*i* finalem et ante eam uocalem pro una syllaba habent” ; and illustrates it by citing Horace Epist. I. 7, 91 : —

durus, ait, Volteî, nimis attentusque uideris,

to which he might have added Carm. II. 7, 5 : —

Pompêi meorum prime sodalium.

If it were strictly true that every vocative in *i* must be one syllable shorter than its nominative, we should have another proof of *Gaius*. For, as it happens, the vocative of *Gaius*, in spite of Priscian, is not *Gai* in one syllable, but *Gāi* in two. Witness these places : —

nunc, *Gāi*, quoniam incilans nos laedi' uicissim.

Lucil. xi, 22, Müll. = 876 Lachm.

quod peto da, *Gāi*, non peto consilium.

Martial, ii, 30.

¹ For instance, thus : —

[*Grandaeus situs hic sum Q*]ueinctius Gāiūs Protymus,
 [sancto cuique uiro su]mma qum laude probatus.
 [constans ing]enium clarat pietatis alumnus,
 [maerens qui hunc tumultum dat, Quinc]tius Valgus patronus.

Whereby, indeed, the inequality of the supplements might be hard to account for.

'quod debes, *Gāi*, redde,' inquit Phoebus et illinc.

Martial, ix, 92.

si donare uocas promittere nec dare, *Gāi*.

Martial, x, 16.

But Priscian's rule is more or less upset by a verse of his own composition : —

sed tamen egregio, *Pompēi*, cede nepoti

in the *Laus Anastasii*, 15 (Bährens PLM. V, p. 265), supported by the weightier testimony of Ovid (*ex Ponto*, iv, 1, 1) : —

accipe, *Pompēi*, deductum carmen ab illo.

That *Pompeius* was three syllables is proved by hosts of examples ; and if *Pompejus* could make *Pompēi*, *Gajus* could make *Gāi*. To be sure, one might urge that *Pompēi* is offset by *Pompēi*, whereas *Gāi* occurs four times, and is the only form found. But this, at most, would furnish a sort of presumption.

However, all uncertainties aside, the testimony collected on pp. 71–73 is amply sufficient to show that *Gāius* is early, and *Gajus* late ; and that *Gāius* is not a 'diaeresis' nor an exceptional freedom taken by the poets, like *Vēius* in Propertius and *Tarpeia* in Martial,¹ but the usual and regular form. There was no motive for distorting the word in verse : *Gājūs* would have fitted in every rhythm as easily as *Quintus* or *Marcus* or *durus*. In fact, any defence of disyllabic *Gaius* as an existent form earlier than the fourth century of our era, must rest solely on two Greek instances — the epigram of Antipater and the inscription from Thessaly. The inscription cannot be dated, even approximately, at present. As published, it is singularly devoid of any indication of age, except the broken bar of A. ΣΤΗΛΛΙΣ, at the beginning of the line, is clearly corrupt, and must represent a name. Otherwise the diction of its three distichs is correct and simple, and does not suggest a late date. As to the epigram of the Anthology, the codex Palatinus here gives γαῖαν, but Γαῖε is preserved by Planudes. 'Antipater' is doubtless the Thessalonican. The epigram has given rise to discussion on other grounds.

¹ Prop. v, 10, 31 ; Mart. xiii, 74, 1.

Whether the Gaius whose mural paintings are described in it is Caligula or C. Caesar the son of Agrippa and Julia we need not stop to decide; thirty years' difference in date does not signify for our purpose. The composition is from the aurea aetas of Latinity, and yet in the measurement of this name it runs counter to the usage of the period. One cannot help wondering why — perhaps even *whether* — the poet did not write ὁ Πρώμος Γάϊε σᾶς ἔργα. Howbeit, we must admit that on the face of the record there is one case, and perhaps two cases, of two-syllable *Gaius*, of the best epoch, in *Greek*.

Here the question arises, how much weight should be assigned to the Greek examples which I have ranged above side by side with the Latin. All will agree, I think, that they can have only secondary and subsidiary force. It would not be strange if poets accustomed to alternatives like δῆμος and δῆϊος, πατρώϊος and πατρώϊος, who might call the father of Oedipus Λάϊος or Λάϊος, as happened to suit them, should have taken some liberties with Latin names of like sort. The following list of instances, which is probably nearly complete, will show the actual usage.¹

Latin measurement preserved: —

- Πομπήϊος (⊥ — ⊥) Kaibel 600.
 Πομπήϊον } (⊥ — ⊥) Kaibel 644.
 Πομπήϊαν }
 Ταρπηΐη (⊥ — ⊥) Anth. Pal. xiv, 121; cod. ταρπαΐη, editors Ταρπεΐη.
 Τραιανός (— ⊥ ⊥) Anth. Pal. vi, 332, Hadrian.²

Latin measurement altered: —

- Ἀπολήϊος (⊥ ⊥ ⊥ ⊥ ⊥) Anth. Pal. ii, 304 }
 Πομπήϊος (— ⊥ ⊥ ⊥) “ “ ii, 398 } Christodorus.
 Πομπήϊη (— ⊥ ⊥ ⊥) “ “ vii, 185. Antipater Thessal.
 Σατυρήϊος (⊥ ⊥ ⊥ ⊥ ⊥) “ “ ix, 776. Diodorus.
 Ἀποληΐα (⊥ ⊥ ⊥ ⊥ ⊥) Kaibel 546.

¹ One sees Πομπήϊος, Κανουλήϊος, Περρήϊος, etc., and even Μδίος, Μαΐωρ constantly printed in our editions of Greek prose-writers. How uncertain the diaeresis is, we see from these poetical examples, which are the only possible criterion.

² Τραιανοῖο, A. P. ix, 210, and Τραιανοῦ, Kaibel 632, are indecisive.

These alterations are all in the direction of distraction; I cannot show an example of contraction. Nevertheless so much is clear, that a Greek poet, in a case like this, is not final and absolute authority as to the pronunciation of a Latin name. And as regards the two cases of Γαῖος, in view of the evidence on the other side, we may say with much confidence that they are probably an hellenizing license; and if not this, that they represent a pronunciation which was beginning to be occasionally heard at Rome, but did not make its way to the front till long afterward.

But why did this name *Gaius* maintain its distract form so long, against the analogy of *Maius*, *Gravius*, and the like? Because it had been *Gaius* at no remote time? One is tempted to make this answer; and indeed I do not know any other to make, if this be not true. The other Italic dialects afford ample evidence that *Gaius* was really the original form of the name. The most distinct indications are found in the Faliscan inscriptions, as the following little collection will show. The citations are from Deecke's 'Falisker' (Dk.), and E. Schneider's 'Dialectorum Italicarum exempla selecta' (Sch.) :—

- Cauio Vetulio (= *Gaius Vetulius*), Dk. 53, Sch. 11.
 Cauio Au. filio (= *Gaius Auli filius*), Dk. 30.
 Caii[o] Cau. [f]ililio (= *Gaius Gai filius*), Dk. 31.
 Caii T[repi] cela (= *Gai Trebi cella*), Dk. 3, Sch. 1.
 Cauia Vetulia (= *Gaia Vetulia*), Dk. 54, Sch. 10.
 Cauia [V]eculia Voltilia (= *Gaia Veculia Volti filia*), Dk. 7, Sch. 7.
 C[a]ui[a]? (= *Gaia*), Dk. 13.
 Caii[a] Vecin[e]a Votilia (= *Gaia Vecinia Volti? filia*) } Dk. 40, Sch. 23.
 Cauia Vecinea (= *Gaia Vecinia*) }
 Caii Tertinei Posticnu (= *Gaia Tertineia Postii filia?* So Deecke), Dk. 63, Sch. 28.
 Caio Folcuz[i]o (= *Gaius Folcusus*) } Dk. 49, Sch. 13.
 Caio (= *Gaius*) }

No other Italic dialect makes a showing like this, but no other writes out its praenomina so frequently. Other Faliscan inscriptions have *C.* or *Ca.*, which of course prove nothing. In Umbrian we find

nothing but the abbreviations *K.*, *C.*, *Ca.* The same is true of the Middle Italian inscriptions (Paeligni, Volsci, etc.) now conveniently collected in Zvetaieff's manual, *Inscriptiones Italiae inferioris*, pp. 1-20. About one of these, n. 35 (= CIL. I, 194) — that beginning CIA PACIA — Deecke¹ suggests that CIA is miswritten for CAIA; others have supposed [*Lu*]cia, or the like. In Oscan, what evidence there is makes for *Gaius*. Generally we find only *G.* or *Ga.*, — perhaps 15 cases. *Perkens Gaaviis* (= *Percennus Gaius*), Zvetaieff, Syll. n. 57, which used to be cited, and *Statii Gaviis*, n. 49, do not count, as *Gaaviis* is gentile, and the gentile even in Latin is almost always *Gaius*.² But perhaps there is one real case: Zvetaieff Syll. n. 4, we read *Kaal. Húsidils Gaavi.* . The stone is broken off, part of the *i* (I) being gone. Because of this *i*, Zvetaieff takes the last name as a cognomen in the nominative. This is laying more stress on Oscan orthography than it will bear. The normal nominative would be either *Gaaviis* or *Gaavits*, and the normal genitive either *Gaavieis* or *Gaaviels*. But both occur in several variations, and if nominatives like *Statii*, n. 16, and *Sabints*, n. 117 (= *Staius*, *Sabinus*), are found, one sees no reason why a genitive *Gaavleis* might not exist. The genitive of the father's name is very customary in Oscan, and cognomina are rather rare. So there is everything in favor of interpreting our inscription as *Calvius* (?) *Hosidius Gai f.*³

It is therefore pretty safe to conclude that the Oscan-speaking peoples said *Gaaviis* for *Gaius*. The Etruscan inscriptions, on the other hand, show no form with *v*.⁴ The dialectic testimony, accordingly stands thus: —

Faliscan: *Cauio*, *Cauia*, *Caio*.

Oscan: *Gaaviis*.

¹ Appendix to Zvetaieff's book, p. 177.

² The relation between praenomina in *-ius* and the gentiles which have exactly the same letters (*Vibius* Virrius and *L. Vibius*; so also *Staius*, *Saluius*, *Nouius*, and several others) is not yet cleared up, even after what Deecke, *Etrusk. Forsch.* VI, p. 61 f., has written. These pairs are most frequent in Oscan and in the Oscan region; in fact, the whole lot seems to belong properly in the south. But does gentile come from praenomen, or praenomen from gentile?

³ Deecke, *Etrusk. Forsch.* VI, p. 63, Falisker, p. 132, takes this *Gaavi.* as a genitive.

⁴ The word *kavi*, standing alone on a tile, is cited by Deecke (*Etrusk. Forsch.* VI, p. 63), who rightly says that it is too uncertain to count.

Etruscan: *Caie, Cai, Cae.*

Umbrian, Sabine, Marsian, Volscian, etc., no evidence.

It seems clear from this that the name must once have had a *V*, even in Latin. But how far back was this time? Did, for instance, C. Marius call himself *Gaius*? Or if not, did C. Gracchus? Or if not he, did C. Flaminius? These questions are not perfectly easy to answer. We have plentiful evidence as to the form of the name in imperial times, but for the republican period the indications are very few. The change from *Gaius* to *Gaius* went unrecorded, because it was almost universally the custom to write nothing but *C*. The Roman who read the sign as *Gaius* could not know that it had ever been read otherwise. No weight can be assigned to the gentile *Gaius*. This kept its *V* always,¹ but while the praenomen *Ga(u)ius* was of the highest antiquity in Latium, and from the time of 'Gaius Cluilus' the Alban 'rex' appears constantly in the Roman annals, the *Gauia* gens is unknown at Rome before the empire,² and in all probability drifted in from the south. The two names exist quite independently so far as Latin is concerned.

Only two Latin inscriptions anterior to the Christian era are known to me, in which this praenomen is written in full. Neither of these is Roman, and neither precisely datable, though both, from general indications, must belong somewhere about the Ciceronic epoch. One is the epitaph of Gaius Quinctius Prothymus, already quoted on p. 74. The other is an inscription of Amiternum, in which occurs the name GAVIA CAESIDIA. The text of the entire epitaph (CIL. I, n. 1298 = IX, n. 3621) is as follows:—

P. Brut'ius P. F. Qui.
Tertia Sapiena C. l.
uxor posit.
Gauia Caesidia
probisuma femina
mater Bruti.

¹ CIL. IV, 825, 1167 (Pompeii), VI, 605, 1009 (Rome), out of scores of inscriptional cases. *Gaius* also occurs as gentile, but rarely. CIL. I, 1257 (Tegianum), *L. Cai*; 1189, 1190 (Fundi), *M. Gaius* (along with *Q. Gaius*).

² Six cases are recorded in the first volume of the CIL.: the places are Fundi, Caiatia, Arpinum, Arretium; one is on an Etruscan tile.

This might seem to be proof positive of the existence of the form *Gaius* as praenomen in the first century B.C. But before this conclusion can be accepted, two rather damaging possibilities must be disposed of.

The first is that *Gauia* may be a gentile, not a praenomen at all. Women with two gentile names occur several times in the older inscriptions of Latium and the adjoining regions.¹ I have noted :

From Praeneste	: Ceisia Loucilia	(CIL. XIV, 4104).
	Dindia Macolnia	(CIL. XIV, 4112 = I, 54).
	Maria Fabricia	(CIL. XIV, 3134).
	Maria Selicia	(CIL. XIV, 3259 = I, 149).
	Rudia Vergelia	(CIL. XIV, 3295 = I, 1501 d).
From Rome	: Cacilia Ania	(CIL. I, 833 = VI, 8222).
From Nemus Dianae	: Poubllilia Turpilia	(CIL. XIV, 4270).
From Casinum	: Agria Sueia, N. f.	(CIL. I, 1183).

These inscriptions (the last excepted) are among the oldest we have. The significance of the double names is by no means perspicuous. We may think of an actual duplication of the family name, arising from a union of estates or other cause. It is also conceivable that the first name of the pair is a personal name—a gentile given as praenomen. There is something to say for this. It would be analogous to an Anglo-American custom now in vogue, by which family names are made to do duty as praenomina, so that a boy is called—let us say Montgomery Wilson, instead of William or Henry Wilson. Now it might be that the same thing occurred in ancient Italy.² But on either of these suppositions, we should expect that men would receive such names as well as women. Now what men's names do

¹ I segregate this group from the externally similar cases—*Aemilia Plotia* and the like—which occur much later, in the imperial period, and are part and parcel of the later system of names. Also, though with more hesitation, from cases like *Vibia Tetidia* (CIL. IX, 3272) and *Salvia Seruia* (I, 1063), because *Salvius* and *Vibius*, whatever their origin, were recognized men's praenomina.

² It is possible that the *Vibius*, *Salvius*, *Nouius* group of names—those which occur both as praenomina and gentiles—may eventually be regarded in this light. See note 2 on p. 79. The difficulty is that only certain particular names are so employed; there is nothing like an indiscriminate use of gentiles as fore-names, either in Latin or Oscan. Deecke takes the opposite view, deriving *Vibius* gentile from *Vibius* praenomen, but to this again there are objections.

we find, of like epoch and locality, to set off against the above list? *Nouios Plautios*, who made Dindia Macolnia's casket, is obviously not a clear case. Besides him, I know only of *Iunio(s) Setio(s)* in CIL. XIV, 4104, from Praeneste. His name certainly resembles those of his five townswomen, but it is strange that we find no more like it. All the men who are registered in the very numerous archaic epitaphs of Praeneste have the regular praenomina, Marcus, Sextus, etc.

It looks as if the custom were confined, or nearly confined, to women's names; and this suggests another theory, namely that one of the gentiles is the husband's name; that *Dindia Macolnia*, for instance, means 'wife of Magulnius, née Dindia' (or the reverse). This view, it seems to me, gets a pretty strong confirmation from the inscription from the Nemus Dianae. The whole of it is as follows: *Poubilia Turpilia Cn. uxor hoc seignum pro Cn. filiod Dianai donum dedit*. This lady mentions not only her husband, but her son, in whose behalf the offering is made, by his praenomen only, and has seemingly forgotten to mention the family surname at all. The omission is well-nigh incredible, but all is in order if we suppose that this surname is Turpilius. The dedication then has a form analogous to that which a man would have employed.¹ In the absence of any other evidence, we may provisionally infer that in these compound feminine names of the olden times, one name designates the *gens* of the father, the other that of the husband.

We return, after this digression, to *Gauia Caesidia* of Amiternum. If we are right in our inference about the group of names we have just been discussing, her name cannot be joined to this group, because her husband was not a Caesidius nor a Gaius, but a Bruttius. It would follow, then, that *Gauia* is praenomen, not gentile, and the first of the two difficulties we spoke of would be removed. On the whole, I think, the chances are in favor of this; but there can be no certainty. The other difficulty remains. Can we be certain that this provincial inscription does not represent the Sabine pronunciation of the name rather than the Latin? Obviously the *V* might have lingered in other parts of Italy long after it had

¹ Her husband, for instance, would have written: *Cn. Turpilius Cn. f. hoc signum pro Cn. filio dedit*.

ceased to be pronounced at Rome. Although the document is a Latin document, it cannot in this point carry the same weight as if it had been written in Latium.

Latin inscriptions, then, lend us very little aid in tracing the early form of the praenomen designated by *C.* It amounts in brief to one certain *Gaius* and one doubtful *Gaius*, of the first century before our era. Indications from other Latin sources there are none to speak of. The auctor de praenominibus derives *Gaius* a *gaudio parentum*: whatever we may think of this etymology, it seems probable that the writer had an inkling of the form *Gau-ius*. His source was probably Varro; Varro then, we may say, knew the name *Gaius*; but Varro certainly knew Sabine and probably other Italic dialects. I have somewhere seen the rich nabob who furnished Julius Caesar with lampreys for his triumphal banquet adduced as a case of the praenomen *Gaius*. But this man's name—he figures in history as *C. Hirrius*—is not so certain as we could wish. Macrobius (Sat. iii, 15, 10) calls him *Gaius Hirrius*, and refers to Pliny. Our manuscripts of Pliny (N. H. ix, 172) give, however, *C. Hirrus*,¹ and in Varro (R. R. iii, 17) the codex Marcianus had simply *Hirrus*.² Putting all together, it seems rather likely that the real name was *Gaius Hirrus*, with some praenomen unknown to us.

There is, however, one remaining source of information, which ought not to be neglected. The Greeks wrote the Roman praenomina, as a rule, in full, and we ought to, and do, get some definite indications from them. We find no Γάιος, but we are enabled to trace Γάιος pretty well back.

First, the text of Polybius contains Γάιος *passim*. Unsupported this would not have great weight, but it is backed by numerous inscriptions.

To begin with 48 B.C.; after Pharsalus the Greek world was well dotted over with statues of Γάιος Ἰούλιος Γάτον υἱὸς Καίσαρ, and many of the inscribed pedestals have survived; as CIG. 2215, 2214 g (Chios), 2368 and 2369 (Carthaea), 2957 (Ephesus), 3668 (Cyzi-

¹ Changed in the printed editions to *C. Hirrius*.

² His name very likely lurks somehow in *Chius Postumius*, Cic. de Fin. ii, 22, but we get no enlightenment from that.

cus), Bull. Corr., viii, p. 153 (Delos), iii, p. 508 (Megara). A contemporary of Caesar was Γάϊος Ἰούλιος Ἀρτεμιδῶρον νιὸς Θεύπομπος, whose statue was set up at Cnidos (Collitz, iii, n. 3527).

A fine series of datable Γάϊος's takes us back to the beginning of the first century. Γάϊος Οὐεργίλιος Γαίον νιὸς Βάλβος, proquaestor, CIG. 5597 (Halaesa) was praetor in 62 B.C. Γάϊος occurs nine times in the Senatus Consultum of Oropus, Hermes xx, p. 268; the date is 73. To the year 74 belongs Τίτος Κλαύδιος Γαίον Τρύφων, Delos, Bull. Corr. viii, p. 146. In the S. C. de Asclepiade, CIL. I, 203 = CIG. 5879, we meet with Γάϊο[s . . . Δευκ]ίου νιός: date 78 B.C. Another S. C., from Lagina in Caria, gives us [Γ]άϊος Φάννιος Γαίον [νιός] and [Γ]άϊος Φονδάνιος Γαί[ου νιός], Bull. Corr. ix, p. 445; date 81. Γάϊος Κοίλιος Κάλδος Γαίον νιός and Γάϊος Σέντιος Γαίον νιός are named in the treaty of Thyrrheum in Acarnania, of 94 B.C., Bull. Corr. x, p. 165. Then Γαί[ος] at Athens, CIA. ii, 985, list of ἀπαρχαί, year 95-4. In Delos again, two freedmen, Ἀρχέλ[α]ος Πομπώνιος Γαί[ο]υ καὶ Γαίον, and Κλεομένης Ἐγνάτιος Ποπλίου Γαίον Γναίον, Bull. Corr. vii, p. 13 = Löwy Inschr. Gr. Bildhauer, n. 306: dated 97-6 B.C. The masters of the latter recur Bull. Corr. viii, p. 488 (Delos), [Π]ό[π]λιος καὶ Γάϊος καὶ Γναίος Ἐγ[νάτι]οι, Κοίντου, Ῥωμαῖοι.

Other cases from Delos, not exactly datable, but from about the same epoch. Γάϊος Ἐρμαῖον Ἀμυσηνός, Bull. Corr. vii, p. 362 (Plutarch Pomp. 42, σύντροφος of Mithradates). Γάϊος Δούκιος Ποπλ[ίου], Γάϊος [Σ]ήϊος, Γάϊος Οὐ[αλ]έριος, Bull. Cor. viii, p. 186. Γάϊος Σήϊος Γναίον Ἀριστόμαχος, Bull. Corr. xi, p. 272, and Ἀθήναιον, 1875, p. 462. Γάϊος Σήϊος Γαίον and Γάϊος Κλαύδιος Γαίον, Bull. Corr. i, p. 284. Γάϊος Ουαλέριος Γαίον νιὸς Τριάριος, Bull. Corr. xi, p. 265. Γάϊος Σανφ[ή]ϊος Ἀῦλον Ζηνόδωρος, Bull. Corr. i, p. 88.

A Γάϊος Γαίον Ἀλαιεύς was clerk of the Athenian senate in the archonship of "Lysander, son of Apolexis," CIA. ii, 489 *b* (Addend. p. 419). The date is not yet known; Köhler inclines to the middle of the first century B.C.

The Attic ephobic lists afford several examples, the oldest being, perhaps, CIA. ii, 483, in which Γάϊος Ῥωμαῖος is enumerated with others of his nation, among the ξένοι, the names of the fathers being omitted. In CIA. ii, 469 (archon Lenaeus), we have Πόπλιος Γαίον Πειραιεύς; in 471 (archon Nicodemus), Γάϊος Γαίον Πειραιεύς and

Γάιος Μαάρκον Μελ[ιτεύς]. These archons are not yet fixed ; Dumont put them in 138 and 136, Köhler thought rather of 90-60 : the latest opinion (Homolle, Bull. Corr. x, p. 6 f.) assigns them to the neighborhood of 125 B.C.

The Romans in Delos set up a statue of their benefactor Γάιος Βιλ[λ]ιη[ν]ός Γαίον υἱός (CIG. 2285 *b* = Bull. Corr. xi, p. 270) ; this man we know as candidate for the consulship about 104. Two of these Delian residents, Δ[ε]ύκιος καὶ Γάιος Πέδιοι Γαίον υἱοί, Ῥωμαῖοι conferred a like honor (CIG. 2285) on a relative of Ptolemy Euergetes II, who reigned from 146 to 117.

A Roman Athenian of note was Γάιος Γαίον Ἀχαρνεύς, who went over to Delos and held various priesthoods there (CIG. 2295, 2296, Bull. Corr. vi, pp. 324, 350). He appears to recur in CIA. ii, 957, [...s] Γαίον Ἀχαρνεύς. The (Athenian) archons named in the Delian records are Nausias, Lyciscus, Dionysius : these belong in a block of seven or eight archons, which may be aptly compared to Delos itself in its earliest recorded condition. The *πλωτὴ νῆσος* has been steered by Homolle into a nook between 119 and 105 B.C., but whether it will take root there, future discoveries must show. Γάιος Κοῦντρον Ῥωμαῖος is on record in Delos (Bull. Corr. vii, p. 370) in the archonship of Diotimus, who belongs in the same block, two years after Dionysius. Κοῦντρος Γαίον of Delos (Bull. Corr. vi, pp. 324 and 325) and Γάιος Γαίον of Ios (Bull. Corr. i, p. 136) cannot be very far off in time.

Two pedestals, found in the same building at Delos, bear the names of Γάιος Κλουῖος Λευκίου υἱὸς στρατηγὸς ὕπατος Ῥωμαίων (Bull. Corr. viii, p. 119) and Γάιος Ὀφέλλιος Μαάρκον υἱὸς Φέρος (Bull. Corr. v, p. 391 = Löwy Inschr. Gr. Bildhauer, n. 242). A C. Cluvius was legate of Aemilius Paullus in 168, and the artists of the other work are known. Homolle and Löwy agree in assigning the works to some time after 150.

The S. C. of Adramyttium (Bull. Corr. ii, p. 129 = Ephem. Epigr. iv, p. 213) contains a string of Γάιος's too long to transcribe : the document is referred by Mommsen to the time of the Gracchi. A Cosconius named in it we know to have been praetor in 135. If Μάρκος Κοσκώνιος Γαίον υἱὸς Ῥωμαῖος, Erythraea (Bull. Corr. iv, p. 156) is the father of this Cosconius, as has been guessed, this inscription would take us yet a stage further back.

We are led distinctly into the first half of the second century by some Delphian records of *proxeni*, Wescher-Foucart, n. 18 (lines 69 and 88), and n. 457; Bull. Corr. vii, p. 191. The men named are Γάιος Στατώριος Γαίου υἱὸς Βρεντεσίνος; Γάιος, son of Μάαρκος Ὀαλέριος Ὀμοπτόνης, both Ῥωμαῖοι; Γάιος Μαννῆμος and Δείκιος καὶ [Κ]νήμιος οἱ Γαίου Μαννῆμου; Μαάρκος Κορνήλιος Γαίου, proxenos in Same.

In a fragmentary Attic document, CIA. ii, 424, Köhler recognizes traces of the name [Γ]αίου [Λαυ]λίου, and refers it to the time after 168 (Pydna). This may be uncertain, but [Μα]ᾶρκος Γαίου Ποπίλλιος in a decree of proxeny from Cierion in Thessaly (Bull. Corr. xiii, p. 400) is clear, and belongs between 178 and 146. The S. C. from Narthacion in Thessaly names Γάιος Ὀστίλιος στρατηγός = C. Hostilius Mancinus praetor (Bull. Corr. vi, 368); date (Laticheff) "150-146." Another S. C. of Thisbe, exactly dated at 170 B.C. (Ephem. Epigr. i, p. 279 = Mitth. Athen. iv, p. 235), mentions Γάιος Δοκρέτιος twice.

We have traced Γάιος pretty far back, but there remain a couple of still older cases. The first is of unusual interest. A decree of the Epirotes conferring proxeny on Γάιος Δάζοντος Ῥέννιος, Βρεντεσίνος, who is twice named, was found at Dodona (Carapanos i, p. 114 = Collitz ii, n. 1339). As στραταγός of the Epirotes is mentioned Antinoos, who is evidently the Antinoos of Polybius, xxvii, 13, and xxx, 7. 2. It seems to have escaped observation so far, that this Rennius is identical with the *L. Rammius, Brundisinus* of Livy 42, 17, who appears as Ἐρέννιος (without praenomen) in Appian, Mac. xi, 7 (vol. i, p. 265, Bkk.). He is the man who was bribed—or believed to have been bribed—by Perseus to poison the leading Roman statesmen, and disclosed the plot to the senate at Rome. The disclosure precipitated the war with Perseus in 172. The decree, which recites the εὐνοία ἂν ἔχων διατελεῖ ποτὶ τοὺς Ἀπειρώτας, was made, without doubt, during Rennius's visit to Perseus, of whom the Epirotes and Antinoos were adherents. This visit preceded the disclosure: so we are led to 173 as the probable date of the decree. The name in Livy is corrupt, but whether the man was really Rennius or Herennius is questionable.

The long temple-inventory of Delos (Bull. Corr. vi, p. 38) mentions a golden crown as Γαίου Λιβίου Ῥωμαίου ἀνάθημα; the date of

the inventory is 180-185; the date of C. Livius Salinator's praetorship in these parts was 191.

Finally we have a S. C. of Delphi (Lebas ii, n. 852) which mentions Γάιος Ἀρίνιος Γαῖον; the date of this monument (see Bull. Corr. xi, p. 225) is 189 B.C. It is now generally agreed that the Greek text of such senatorial acts was composed *in Rome itself*; so this earliest example has a special authenticity.

This is the oldest case that I have so far found. I do not claim absolute completeness for my collection, yet think that not much has escaped me.

As results of the foregoing investigation, we may lay down: (1) that the name designated by the Romans by the letter *C* was originally *Gaius*; (2) that this form at Rome had passed into *Gaius* by 190 B.C., though it survived longer in some of the provinces of Italy; (3) that for some reason, not assignable at present, the customary pronunciation (of the educated classes at least) remained *Gaius* (trisyllabic) at any rate until the end of the first century of our era, and probably still longer.